RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 0 6 2008

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed September 6, 2007, the Applicants submit this Reply. Applicants also submit a Request for Continued Examination and a Rule 131 declaration. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 13-18 remain in this application, of which claims 13 and 17 are independent. No fee is due for claim amendments.

In the Final Office Action, claims 13-18 were rejected.

Prior Art rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 13-18 remaining in this application, of which claims 13 and 17 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Japanese patent publication 2004-15181 ("Fujimori") and under §103 in further view of allegedly applicant admitted prior art ("AAPA"), namely paragraphs [0028], [0050], [0051] and [0052] of the present application. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to Fujimori, a module converts between a USB 2.0 bus and an IEEE-1394 bus (see abstract).

Regarding the allegations of admitted prior art, the Office Action states, "the requirements of any transmission that converts between IEEE-1394 to USB in a way that complies with both notoriously well-known specifications requires that such drivers are present." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the position taken in the Office Action. The statement in the Office Action is an assertion by the Examiner, not an admission by the Applicant. The only prior art admitted by the applicant in the application is that it is known how to make a Windows driver that complies with the IEEE-1394 specification and it is known how to make a Windows driver that complies with the USB specification.

The invention as claimed in independent claims 13 and 17 involves sending IEEE-1394 commands through a USB port, but back to an IEEE-1394 device. The prior art fails to teach the kind of transmission as claimed.

In particular, regarding claim 13, Fujimori fails to teach or suggest that the video application *on a computer* generates IEEE-1394 commands, which are then converted *in the computer* to USB commands, which are then transmitted over a USB connection in the computer

to a converter device, which in turn converts the USB command back into a IEEE-1394 command, which in turn is transmitted to the digital video device. Fujimori merely provides a USB-IEEE-1394 converter device and is silent about additional IEEE-1394-to-USB conversion being performed in the computer. The prior art therefore fails to teach sending IEEE-1394 commands from a video application to a video device by sending such commands through a USB bus.

Similarly regarding claim 17, Fujimori fails to teach or suggest that the digital video device generates IEEE-1394 commands, which are then converted in a converter device to USB commands, which are then transmitted over a USB connection to the computer, which in turn converts the USB command back into a IEEE-1394 command, which in turn is provided to the video application on the computer. Fujimori merely provides a USB-IEEE-1394 converter device and is silent about additional IEEE-1394-to-USB conversion being performed in the computer.

Accordingly, independent claims 13 and 17 are allowable over Fujimori and the alleged admitted prior art. The remaining claims are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Furthermore, Applicants have submitted a declaration under Rule 131 attesting to conception and reduction to practice of the presently claimed invention prior to the effective date of Fujimoro, rendering it ineligible to be used as a prior art reference. The declaration of co-inventor is supported by three documents relevant to the commercial product integrating the presently claimed invention prior to January 15, 2004. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on this separate ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee

occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876.**

Respectfully submitted,

Avid Technology, Inc.

By _____
John A. Hamilton
Registration No. 48,946
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Tel.: (978) 640-6789